



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,409	02/21/2002	Shubhen Kapila	399756	2767

30954 7590 03/18/2003

LATHROP & GAGE LC
2345 GRAND AVENUE
SUITE 2800
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108

EXAMINER

LOVERING, RICHARD D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1712	

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/081,409

Applicant(s)

KAPILA ETAL

Examiner

LOVERING

Group Art Unit

1712

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on FEB 21, 2002
- ☐ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9-14, 31 AND 32 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9-14, 31 AND 32 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2
- ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Serial No. 10/081,409

-2-

Art Unit 1712

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuhisa et al. 5,431,837, esp. Example 2. While Matsuhisa et al. do not state that their compositions are solvents for extracting, the recitation of a new or different intended use does not render an old composition new or patentable. See In re Thuau, 1943 C.D. 390; 554 O.G. 14; and In re Zierden, 411 F. 2d 1325; 162 USPQ 102.

3. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obvious-type or non-obvious-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornam, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78 (d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a Terminal Disclaimer. A Terminal

Disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-5, 9-14, 16, 31 and 32 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of copending application Serial No. 09/491,185. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the stated instant claims read on, or at least overlap, the claim of the '185 application.

This is a *provisional* obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-5, 9-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The proviso clauses lack antecedent basis and

not eligible for patent protection

support in the original disclosure herein and in the parent case, and are considered new matter.

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for hydrofluorocarbon, perfluorocarbon, hydrochlorofluorocarbon or mixtures thereof as to the non-polar halogenated solvent, does not reasonably provide enablement for bromo-or hydrobromo-or iodo-or hydroiodo-carbons as the non-polar halogenated hydrocarbon. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicants specifically disclose only certain fully or partially chlorinated or fluorinated hydrocarbons, and it would involve more than routine experimentation on the part of one having ordinary skill in the art to determine which bromo-, hydrobromo-, iodo-or hydroiodo-carbons would be useful in the claimed solvent compositions, noting the different properties of bromo-or hydrobromo-and/or iodo-or hydroiodo-carbons vs. the per-fluoro, hydrofluoro- and hydrochlorofluoro-carbons.

8. The remaining references listed on the attached Form PTO-1449 are cumulative to the reference applied herein, and/or further show the state of the art.

Serial No. 10/081,409

-5-

Art Unit 1712

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lovering whose telephone number is (703) 308-0443. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 7:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Dawson, can be reached on (703) 308-2340. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

R. Lovering:cdc
March 5, 2003

Richard D. Lovering
RICHARD D. LOVERING
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP ~~1200~~ 1700